

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XXII. No. 19.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, NOV. 7, 1812.

[Price 1s.]

577]

[578

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

LIVERPOOL ELECTION.—This election, at which Messrs. Brougham, Creevey, Canning, Gascoygne, and Tarleton were candidates, and which has ended in the choosing of Messrs. Canning and Gascoygne, has given rise to the making and publishing of some speeches of Mr. Canning, which merit attention.—These speeches have been made at dinners given to him by the corrupt crew through whose influence he has been returned; and, it is worthy of remark, that he has shown a greater fondness for speech-making at Taverns than any of those, whom he and his associates have heretofore reproached for such a practice.—I have now before me his speeches made at the dinner of the 26th of October, some parts of which are well calculated to call forth the indignation of every man who has left in him any regard for the honour and happiness of the country.—He was well aware, that his treaters consisted principally of those men, who have thriven, and who still thrive, upon THE WAR; and, therefore, he took the opportunity not only to justify (as far as he was able) the continuance of the war, but also to applaud the measures which first produced it, and which had prolonged it.—In doing this, he put forward assertions and arguments, which, though perfectly congenial with the taste and interests of his hearers, demand our serious reprobation.—“Commerce,” he said, “and peace were linked together.” “And it had been endeavoured to be insinuated by his opponents, that they alone could be the faithful guardians of their interests. He admitted this as a general principle. Lovers of peace! who were not lovers of peace? In the abstract, who were lovers of war, of famine, or of pestilence? Those who published these propositions knew they were deceiving the audience they addressed. They knew that the questions of peace and war were amongst the most difficult questions that imagination could conceive, or human genius could be called upon to disentangle. Those were not simple propositions

“of elementary truth. No, they were always interwoven with *considerations* and *circumstances* which they well knew would perplex the discussion of those subjects with difficulties whenever they were proposed; but these they kept out of sight when they wished to make an impression on popular feelings. These men talk of peace in a state of the world in which all those ties which compose the elements of society were weakened, almost rent asunder, by the desolating principles of our enemy. They talk of peace, and of themselves as the lovers and advocates of peace, as absurdly as if an inhabitant of a West India island, amidst earthquakes and volcanoes, should talk of physical order and perpendicular position. Who does not love light better than darkness? But when *the storm is abroad for purposes inscrutable to us* in the moral as in the physical world, when PROVIDENCE has *let loose upon us this scourge of mankind*, to talk of loving peace in the abstract would be a reflection upon the understanding of those men, if it did not call in question the heart. Absurd as the doctrine was when applied to our state and the state of the world in general, with what aggravated absurdity did it present itself to our view in a great commercial town. Peace—WITH WHOM? With that *friend of peace*, with him who had fostered the commercial intercourse of mankind, and with him who had told them publicly that it is his object to destroy that which was the foundation of their greatness; that which is the glory of their state.”

—This is no more than a repetition of the old, the vile, the hypocritical cant, with which this long and bloody war was begun and continued for the first ten years. Let us, however, examine it a little, and see whether it ought to form any excuse for those who have been guilty of the shameful act of electing its frothy and impudent author.—He asks, who is a lover of war in the *abstract*; who is a lover of *famine* or of *pestilence*?—Nobody, to be sure. Nobody loves war merely for *war's sake*,

T

merely because it produces misery to the nations who carry it on; but, there are, as Mr. Canning well knows, thousands and thousands, who are lovers of *what they gain by war*, and of these many thousands four hundred are said to have been before his eyes at the moment he was speaking. No, they do not love war merely for the *sake of war*; of *famine*; and of *pestilence*; they, on the contrary, love it for the sake of its profits to them; for the sake of the fine houses, and carriages, and horses, and footmen that it gives them. They know, indeed, that it impoverishes others, that it creates paupers and misery amongst the community at large; that it sheds rivers of blood, and produces an enormous mass of human woes; they know that it causes scenes like those at Walcheren and at Moscow; but, they do not love war for the sake of these things; they love war for the sake of the profits arising to them out of contracts, commissaryships, paymasterships, transport hire, per-centage on taxes, staff appointments, and the like; they love war for the sake of the large sums it causes to be raised in taxes, and of which sums they have a great deal more than the soldiers and sailors; this is what they love war for; and, if they could have the money without the misery and the bloodshed and the fire and the sacking, they would, I dare say, prefer it; but, as this cannot be; as they could not get at the public money without the channel of war, they love war, and with all its miseries to others, they prefer it to peace.—These are the reasons for their being lovers of war. They do not love war in the *abstract*, but for the “*circumstances and considerations*” with which war is interwoven. If any one wishes to be satisfied of this, let him take his pen and divide the forty millions a year which the war costs into two parts; let him put by itself all the money which is *paid to the soldiers and sailors*; then he will see what remains to be paid away to contractors and others who gain by the war; and, when he has this view of the “*circumstances and considerations*” before him, he will cease to wonder at Mr. Canning (one of the principal supporters of the war) being feasted by 400 persons.—So much for the flimsy observation about the loving of war in the abstract, which has no more sense in it than there would be in saying, that a dealer in seats does not love bribery and corruption in the abstract; or, that the murderer of the Marrs and Williamsons did not love blood in the abstract.

If the villain, who murdered the Marrs and Williamsons, and the more cowardly villain, who has assisted to murder his country by trafficking in seats, or by justifying such traffick, could have got the money which was the object of their deeds without the blood or the bribery, there is no doubt that they would have preferred it; but, they must have the money, and not being able to come at it without the bribery and the blood, they resorted to them, without loving them in the abstract any more than Mr. Canning's hearers love war in the abstract.—I dare say, that it is not an *abstract* love that Mr. Canning and his Mother and Sisters have to their *sinecures* and *pensions*. They do not, I'll engage, like them so well as they would like estates in house and land: it is the “*circumstances and considerations*,” that is to say, the *money* which is attached to those grants which makes them love the grants; and, as long as war is profitable to so many thousands and hundreds of thousands of persons; as long as there are so many to gain by the war, so long the supporters of war will have friends and abettors. This is the character in which Mr. Canning was supported at Liverpool; he was voted for as an advocate for war and for a corrupt influence in parliament; and he well knew, that, at the very moment that his speech was applauded, he was viewed with contempt. The contempt was, indeed, mutual: he despised his hearers for their motives; and they despised him for his.—Having talked about war in the abstract, Mr. Canning next came to speak of those “*circumstances and considerations*,” which he had before hinted at. Who, he asks, does not love peace in the *abstract*? And then he proceeds, in his way, to state the *obstacles* to peace. Now, what are these? Hear him: “But, when the *storm* is *abroad* for purposes *inscrutable* to us, in the moral as in the physical world, when *PROVIDENCE* has let loose upon us the scourge of mankind” Stop! stop! Thou pious Clerk of the Hanaper! Do stop and let us discuss this with you a little.—What is meant by the “storm being abroad?” Deceivers, impostors, all the tribe deal in tropes and figures. What storm is it that we are in? We are in a *war*, and a war of our own making too, for we *began* the war by seizing French ships at sea and in our ports, and by making prisoners of French people; and how, thou frothy declaimer; how, thou man of tropes, is the storm to be put

an end to but by a *peace*?—But, you tell us, that this storm is abroad “for purposes inscrutable to us.” Oh! no; the purposes are perfectly scrutable, as I have shown above. The *profits* of war to its advocates are as clearly to be defined as the amount of your sinecure.—“PROVIDENCE has *let loose upon us* the scourge “of mankind;” and, *therefore*, to talk of loving peace in the abstract is extreme folly.—“Indeed, Captain, it was the “*cudgel*,” as Stephen observes to Bobadil, when the latter complains of being *Planet-struck*. Indeed, Mr. Canning, Providence has had no special spite against us: indeed and indeed it is not Providence who has interfered in the war: it was Mr. Pitt and his associates, siding with the old governments of Europe: they it was, and not Providence, who first let loose the genius and courage of the French people against the regal and ecclesiastical establishments of Europe, and you and your colleagues have assisted mainly in preventing those assailants from laying down their arms. The measures of tyrannical and besotted men, calling themselves statesmen, and not any particular decree of Providence, have produced the dangers which you describe.—But, suppose you to be right in this assertion, how does it agree with other assertions that you have made upon this and former occasions?—If it be Providence who has let loose Napoleon upon us, why do you revile Napoleon? If he be an instrument in the hands of Providence, is it just, nay, is it not impious, to rail against him for what he has done, and is doing, in that capacity? To rail against him for doing what Providence forces him to do, is, in fact, to rail against Providence. And, thus it is, that a frothy coxcomb, intoxicated with the plaudits of a servile and venal crew, exposes himself to the ridicule and contempt of men of sense.—If we adopt this doctrine of Mr. Canning; if we admit that the legation of Buonaparté is of divine origin, it seems to me, that we must, at once, cease all our philippics against him on account of the devastation, the plunder, the bloodshed, and all the other horrid things that are said to accompany his footsteps. The Russians charge him with having caused the city of Moscow to be burnt. This is not true, but, suppose it were true? Who would dare to blame him, or even the act, if the doctrine of Mr. Canning be admitted? Moses did more in the way of devastation, slaughter, bloodshed, and the rest of it,

than Napoleon has done. Upon one particular occasion, as it is recorded in the Holy Scriptures, the army under Moses’s command *killed all the men* of a country that he attacked, and “took,” says the Bible, “all the *women* of Midian captives, and “their little ones, and took the spoil of all “their cattle, and all their flocks, and all “their goods. And they *burnt all their “cities* wherein they dwelt and *all their “goodly castles* with fire. And they took “all the spoil, and all the prey, both of “men and of beasts. And they brought “all the spoil, &c. &c. &c. to Moses and “*Eleazar the Priest*.”—Well; but things did not stop here; for, as we are told, in the same Chapter, “Moses was “*wroth* with the officers of the host;” and, for what? We shall hear: “And “Moses said unto them: *Have you saved “all the WOMEN alive?* Behold, these “caused the children of Israel, through the “counsel of Balaam, to commit trespass “against the Lord in the matter of Peor, “and there was a plague among the congregation of the Lord. Now, therefore, “KILL every male amongst the LITTLE “ONES, and kill every WOMAN that “hath known man by lying with him. “But all the women children that have not “known man by lying with him, KEEP “ALIVE FOR YOURSELVES.”—These acts are recorded in the book of Numbers, Chapter xxxi. And, as to Joshua, who, next after Moses, appears to have been the favourite instrument in the hands of Providence, he not only slew men, women, and children, without regard to age or condition; he not only set whole cities on fire, and exterminated their inhabitants, but, upon one particular occasion, when fighting against a most rascally combination of crowned heads, namely, the king of Jerusalem, the king of Hebron, the king of Jarmuth, the king of Lachish, and the king of Eglon; upon this occasion Joshua, not finding the day long enough for the completing of his slaughter, commanded the sun and moon to stand still; and, it is written, “that *the sun stood still*, and the moon “*stayed*, until the people had *avenged themselves upon their enemies*.”—Now, as Mr. Canning will not, I presume, attempt to question the justice and propriety of the acts thus recorded, so, I presume, he will not deny that they are to be justified only because the actors were set on, or, to use his own words, *let loose*, by Providence; and, if this be a justification, as it is held to be, of Moses and Joshua, has not

Mr. Canning been providing a justification for Napoleon, even supposing all the acts ascribed to him have really been committed by him? The killing of all the grown women and all the male children of the Midians, and the ordering of all the young girls to be kept alive for the soldiers, seem to equal, at least, any thing that even Sir Robert Wilson has attributed to Buonaparté; but, then, observe, in the case of Moses, he was, we know, sent by the Lord to cause these orders to be put in execution; whereas, as we have hitherto been led to believe, Buonaparté is an infidel and more likely to be sent by the Devil; but, we are now told, all at once, we now hear it roundly asserted, that he is sent by Providence, that is to say, by the Lord, and, of course, that his legation has the same origin as that of Moses; whence, if we were to admit the doctrine of Mr. Canning, it would naturally result, that Buonaparté is to be applauded instead of censured for the killings, and burnings, and devastations that have been ascribed to his commands!

—Some persons, and I amongst others, have been reproached with being an *apologist* for Napoleon; what, then, ought to be said of the man, who, in the most public manner, holds him forth to the nation as one sent against, and let loose upon it, by Divine Providence itself; aye, by that very Being, on whom, in a prayer prepared by the Archbishop of Canterbury, we are, by royal proclamation, commanded to call for protection against that same Napoleon? What shall be said of the man who does this; and what shall be said of the crew who are said to have received his harangue with rapturous applause?—But, again, if Napoleon be an instrument in the hands of Providence, what hope is there that we shall be successful in resisting him? I leave it for casuists like Mr. Canning to decide, whether it be consistent with religion to resist one who comes armed with the authority of Providence; but, is it possible that we can *succeed* in such resistance? Napoleon has been called impious because he said that he was destined by Providence to new-model Europe; yet Mr. Canning asserts the fact; and, if it be a fact, it surely is a great consolation to us, and, above all, a great encouragement to proceed in the war. There is scarcely ever a King's Speech which does not conclude with a prayer for success in the war, *under the protection and with the aid of Divine Providence*; but, if Napoleon has been let loose upon us by Divine Providence, Divine

Providence is on *his* side, and then what hope have we of success in the war, unless Mr. Canning takes it for granted, that Divine Providence, like the rest of our former allies, is in future to be numbered amongst our enemies, and entertains hopes of beating Divine Providence and Buonaparté too?

—Leaving this disgusting, this hypocritical cant, to the admiration of the electors of Mr. Canning, let us hear his other objections to peace. "*Peace*," says he, "*with whom?*" Why, with him, whom we made peace with before; with him whom Mr. Addington and Lord Liverpool (*whose healths were given by Mr. Canning at this dinner*) made peace; with him from whom we received, in the way of cession, the islands of Ceylon and Trinidad, though belonging to the Dutch and the Spaniards; with him whom we acknowledged, by the most solemn acts, to be the legitimate chief magistrate of France; with him who, upon a charge of having endeavoured to rouse the people of France against his authority, Mr. Peltier was prosecuted in the Court of King's Bench, and, upon the recommendation of the Judge, found guilty of a criminal libel; with him whom, in a convention at Cintra, Lord Wellington acknowledged to be Emperor of France; with him to whom we have sent envoys and ambassadors, and with respect to whom we have done every thing that is usually done by us towards foreign sovereigns.—This is the man with whom we might, only a few months ago, have had peace; and this, I take it, is a pretty satisfactory answer to the question of Mr. Canning, "*with whom?*"—But, he goes on to ask if Napoleon be "*the friend of peace?*" In answer to this we may say, that we can only judge of him by his acts; and that, if to have frequently tendered the olive branch to his enemies, and particularly to our Government; if to have sought negotiation for peace in the midst of victories; if to have voluntarily put a stop to his career of conquest and glory by treaties of peace; if to have got the better of the pride and passion imputed to him for the purpose of procuring peace; if to have been ready to yield even the ostensible object of a ten years' war for the sake of peace with us; and if to have now a manifest interest in the making and the preserving of peace in Europe; if all these put together constitute a fair claim to the title of "*friend of peace*;" then my answer to Mr. Canning is, that Napoleon is the friend of peace, and that those are the real enemies of peace

who refuse to treat upon a basis similar to that which was offered to our Government only a few months ago.—We now come to a part of Mr. Canning's speech, which, though a sad hodge-podge, demands a good deal of attention, as being a fair specimen of the sophistry and falsehood by which the people are deluded into an approbation of the continuation of the war against France.

—"They" (meaning his antagonists at the election) "describe," he said, "in glowing colours what are the sufferings of war, and they fain would persuade us that those who, in spite of our sufferings, exhort us to persevere, are *insensible to the miseries of our fellow creatures*. War had its miseries in the stagnation of commerce, and in the privation of many domestic comforts; who was the man that had a heart to look at them without being affected. But he wished his adversaries would deal fairly. War, he observed, was full of difficulty and danger; yet it had *its consolations too*; but how happens it that those Gentlemen invert the glass when they look at the victories of our enemies; *as they are presented to our view, we hear no particulars of the miseries and privations to which they subject the inhabitants of France*; but on the other hand, when they looked at our exploits, they turned the diminishing side of the glass, and presented a magnified view of our miseries. But I would ask them whether the *mother in France, when delivered of a male child, did not look forward to the 19th year, when he was to be torn to pitiless destruction?* He would ask them, *whether agriculture was not languishing for want of male population?* The subjects of the conqueror are consoled by glory, but let us be mindful of their *unhappiness*; and in a war *from which we cannot extricate ourselves*, let the perseverance which England has already so successfully exerted, be continued. If *peace could be obtained*, God forbid that it should not be so! but is peace to be enjoyed with *the security of peace?* It must be so enjoyed, or it would only substitute a temporary repose, to be followed by a more dreadful and destructive war. It had been said, and said wisely, too, that character had its inconveniences, that a man of reputation dared not do a base action, though it might be advantageous, and to extend that remark from individuals to national character, it might be safely asserted that, when a nation

forfeited its honour, it had forfeited its existence. Not such the opinions of our adversaries, who think that *peace pursued at that price is preferable to war carried on with such sacrifices as we are making.*"—Let us take this passage in its regular order.—Mr. Canning professes to *feel* for the miseries of those who suffer so severely from the war; but, it is easy to *profess*; and, until he gives up the receipt of the sums he receives as a *sinecure placeman*, together with all that he has received from that source, I do not choose to give him much credit for *feeling* for the sufferings of the people. He may ask as long as he pleases, "what man with a heart can look at these sufferings without being affected;" but, while he continues to pocket a part of the taxes which produce these sufferings, I shall be disposed to set down questions like this to the account of hypocrisy.—"War," he says, "has its *consolations*;" but, as he does not tell us *to whom*, we must suppose him to mean, *to those who thrive by the war*; for, as to consolation arising from the miseries of the people of France, that, I believe, is of a sort to be felt by nobody, or, at least, by nobody but the most malignant of the sons and daughters of corruption.—Let us, however, inquire into the fact as far as he descends to particulars.—He says, he would ask, "whether the MOTHER in France, when delivered of a *male child*, does not look forward to the 19th year, when he is to be *torn to pitiless destruction*; and whether *agriculture* is not languishing there *for want of a male population?*"—Now, reader, here are two questions, which I will answer fully; and, I am persuaded, to your satisfaction, though, perhaps, not much to that of Mr. Canning.—The gentleman is, however, here, a very barefaced plagiarist. Not stored with sufficient falsehoods of his own, he has robbed the Courier news-paper of a part, at least, of what he has, in this place, spouted off upon his friends at Liverpool. The trick of putting his propositions into the shape of *questions* must not screen him from the charge of uttering falsehood. He does, in fact, here mean to give the weight of assertion to what those questions point at; he means that his hearers should understand, 1st. That the mothers in France, when delivered of male children, are made miserable by the reflection, that, when they attain the age of 19 years, they will be torn from them, as soldiers, to *pitiless destruction*; and, 2d. That agriculture lan-

guishes in France for the *want of men*, the drain of men by the war having been so great.—This *second* assertion was made by the Editor of the *Courier* in the month of April last, and of that Editor, Mr. Canning is, in this instance, at least, no more than an imitator.—I exposed the falsehood then, and shall now do little more than repeat what I then said. When I have so done, I shall return to the *first* assertion, and give my reasons for believing, that the first is as false as the second.—

—We come now to a fact, which, one would have supposed, that even no hireling would have had the assurance to state. It is this: that, in consequence of the drain of men, occasioned by the war, the land in France, is chiefly cultivated by women! Mark this fact, reader! “The land is chiefly cultivated by women;” and, says the hireling, this is “a fact upon which our readers may rely!”—This is worthy of particular notice, as being a striking specimen of the imposture of these hired writers and of the credulity of this nation, the great mass of whom appear never to think for themselves, and to possess none of the capacity necessary for the detection of falsehood.—Let us try this fact by the test of reason; this famous fact, upon which the readers of the *Courier* are told “they may rely.” The assertor produces no proof of it. He does not pretend to have been in France himself; nor does he produce any evidence, not even the evidence of fabricated letters or dispatches. Well, then, he has no grounds for his assertion, and I might dismiss it at once as false; but, considering that its object and tendency are to deceive the people as to the real state of France, and to encourage them to approve of a continuance of the war with a view to produce the downfall of Buonaparté, I will offer a few further remarks upon the subject.—The war, we are told, has so drained France of men, that the land is now chiefly cultivated by women. Now, reader, please to attend to a few facts. Napoleon, agreeably to the report laid before the Senate last year, has 800,000 men in arms. We are now to consider what is the population out of which this number of men is taken and kept up. The population of France alone, before the revolution, was 26 millions. Every one knows, that population keeps pace with food; and, when we consider the immense wastes, parks, pleasure grounds, &c. that have, during the last 20 years, been brought into cultivation; when we

consider the effect of dividing large estates into small parcels, and making such an amazing augmentation in the number of land proprietors, all cultivating their own soil; when we consider that from 2 to 300,000 bishops, priests, monks, and nuns, who could not marry, and who possessed a good third part of the land and other property of the kingdom, have made way for multitudes of fathers, mothers, and children, now fed by the produce of that same land; when we consider these things, it is impossible not to conclude, that the population of France herself, if we were to go no further, is greatly increased. But, let us suppose it to have remained stationary, and to be still what it was before the revolution; that is to say, that it still amounts to no more than 26 millions of people. This being the case, France furnishes 1 man in arms out of every $32\frac{1}{2}$ of her people.—And now, then let us see what this kingdom, this “United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland;” this kingdom with a long name, and which has, in the bombast of the news-papers, an “Imperial Parliament;” let us see what this kingdom furnishes of men in arms: because, if we find that it furnishes more in proportion than France does, and if we see that the cultivation of the land has not fallen upon the women in this kingdom, we shall then have pretty good proof of the falsehood of what the *Courier* asserts with respect to the present employment of the women in France.—The population of this kingdom, including emigrants, blacks, lascars, and Germans, together with all the birds of passage for ever coming into and going out of it; including all these, our population may, perhaps, be swelled up to nearly 15 millions. Now, according to the army estimates of last year, we had in the Regular Army, including the embodied Militia, 382 thousand men; and, in the navy, 145 thousand, making, together, 527,000 men. In some of our boasting accounts, published in the news-papers, they have been called 640,000 men. But 527,000 we paid for. Some few thousands more, indeed; but, let us be within compass. Now, then, we shall find, that this kingdom (would it had a short name!); we shall find that this kingdom furnishes 1 man in arms out of every $28\frac{1}{2}$ of its people; we shall find, that while the Emperor of France calls for one man out of $32\frac{1}{2}$ of his subjects, our king calls for one man out of $28\frac{1}{2}$ of his subjects; we shall find, that the drain of men is one seventh greater upon our popula-

tion than it is upon that of the French; and, as we know very well, that this drain has not thrown upon the women the cultivation of the land in England, we must, if we would be thought rational men, conclude, that this story about the cultivation of the land in France by women is a falsehood; a sheer invention for the purpose of deceiving the people of this country, and of favouring the views of those who delight in war, because it enriches them and their families.—“But,” exclaims the reader, “you have forgotten!” Oh! no, I have not forgotten! I have not forgotten that Old France contains but a part of that population, out of which Napoleon draws his 800,000 men; I have not forgotten, that he is king of Italy, that Holland and Brabant and the Hans Towns and part of Germany belong to his empire; and that he not only draws troops from all these, but from the more distant parts of Europe governed by sovereigns his allies. Oh! no; I have not forgotten that his empire contains upwards of 40,000,000 of people, instead of 26,000,000; but I had a mind to shew how the comparison stood with France alone, in order to put this hireling the more completely to shame.—Take, then, Napoleon’s empire at 40,000,000 of people, which is far within bounds, and you will find, that he takes but one man in arms out of every 50 of his people; while our king takes one man in arms out of every 28½ of his people! And yet, this hireling has the impudence to attempt to make us believe, that the drain of men in France has thrown the cultivation of the land upon the women! If scarcity and discontent be produced in France by a drain of one out of fifty, what must the drain of one of twenty-eight and a half produce? Thus does this hireling strike into the bowels of his own government, when he is aiming the blow at that of Napoleon. But, such is the desire to decry the government of France; so eager the desire to make the people here believe that the French are slaves, that the consequence of such efforts to our government are wholly overlooked.—So much for this fact, upon which, he says, his readers may rely.—We will now return to Mr. Canning’s first assertion; namely, that the mothers, in France, when delivered of male children, are made miserable by the reflection, that, when they shall have attained the age of 19 years, they will be *torn* from them to *pitiless de-*

struction.—In the first place this is an exaggeration. It is a falsehood conveyed in empty bombast. Mothers, when they are delivered, think nothing about what is to become of their children. But, the intention here is to deceive the people of England as to the *mode* of raising soldiers in France, as well as to the proportion of young men taken from their homes to serve as soldiers, and also to deceive them as to the *nature of the service* which those young men are employed in.—This is a subject of great consequence; because, upon the assumption, that the Conscription is intolerable in France, is built the conclusion, that the people of France must hate the government of Napoleon, and must be ready to fall into any project for the deliverance of their country from what is called his tyranny; and on this is grounded the further conclusion, that, if we do but continue the war for a little longer, we shall upset this formidable enemy.—Now, then, let us see how the case stands.—*First*, it is false to say, that the mothers are at all affected by what *may* happen to their children at the end of 19 years; *second*, the conscription cannot, as we have seen above, take but a comparatively small portion of the young men away; *third*, the mode of taking them to be *general*, must be *impartial*, and, of course, much less, infinitely less, galling than if the hardship fell upon the poor only; *fourth*, it is not to *pitiless destruction* that they are sent, but to war, and war attended with all the glory, renown, and advantage, that belong to victory and conquest. Besides, reader, bear in mind these important facts, which even the assurance of Mr. Canning will not induce him to deny; namely, that, the private soldiers in the French army are treated with great respect by their officers; that they are permitted to share, under the name of plunder, very largely in the fruit of victory; and, above all, that, **OUT OF THE RANKS ALL THE COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ARE TAKEN.** Consider this, consider that Massena, Brune, Victor, Marmont, Soult, Suchet, were all private soldiers; consider, that, out of 16 Marshals of France, who are now Dukes and Princes, 14 were the sons of Farmers and Tradesmen; consider that all the regiments, all the rank, all the honours, all the emoluments of the service, which, indeed, constitute nine tenths of all the honours and emoluments of the empire, are enjoyed, and must be enjoyed, by men who are in the first

place private soldiers: consider, too, that there is one commissioned officer to about every twenty privates; and then you will, I am persuaded, agree with me, that each conscript puts his services into a pretty good lottery.—Mr. Canning forgot these things; or he was too ignorant of the affairs of France to know any thing of them; or, which is full as likely, he wished to put a false picture before the people of England.—If, indeed, all the commissions, all the honours, all the emoluments of the service were swallowed up by the sons of the rich, and if nothing but hardships and the knocking out of brains were left for the sons of the poor; if promotion did not proceed from the ranks; then I should be ready to believe, that the conscription in France must of necessity create great discontents; but, where the chance of promotion is so fair; where the lottery is so rich and the blanks so few, I am not to be made believe, that the conscription, though still a heavy burden, is viewed with any thing approaching to feelings of horror.—It is to be observed, besides, that the genius of the French people is *military*; that it always was so; that to become even a private soldier always raised a man in the scale of public estimation; that to have *served* was, in all times, a matter of boasting in France, and a settled title to a larger share of respect than the party would otherwise have put in a claim to.—These are considerations which escape us in this country, and this is the reason why we hear so many persons, otherwise well-informed, expressing their astonishment at the zeal and fidelity of the French soldiers and at the submission of the people to the laws of the conscription.—We will now leave Mr. Canning to condole with the lying-in mothers in France, while we observe upon the false and malignant conclusion of the passage last quoted, where he says, that we, who are for treating for peace, “are willing to purchase it at the expense of the honour of our country.”

—He does not pretend to produce any *proof* of this assertion, which is, indeed, no more than a repetition of the old stale calumny, which has been in use by him and his like for the last twenty years. But, he lays it down as an axiom, that we cannot have peace with the *security of peace*. This he does not attempt to *prove*, and it is also an old battered assertion. He afterwards observes, that we *cannot be safe alone*; that our *lot* is cast with that of the *civilized world*, by which he, doubtless,

means the old governments of Europe, including the *Inquisition of Spain*, which, as our own news-papers informed us, was re-established at Madrid in a few days after our army got possession of the place. And, is our *lot* cast with the Inquisition; are we to stand or fall with that; and are those to be denominated enemies of their country, who refuse to act upon such a notion? My opinion is, that, if our resources were well and honestly managed, we, *alone*, might set the world at defiance, if the world, which is not to be believed, should, in that case, be resolved to act unjustly towards us; and, therefore, I would have treated with Napoleon upon the basis of his last proposition. If we adopt Mr. Canning's notion, which, disguise it however he may, is that of a necessity of continuing the contest till we have restored the old governments of Europe, our case is, indeed, desperate.—We have now done with the first speech of Mr. Canning at this dinner; but, there was a *second*, made upon the arrival of the Boroughreeve of Manchester, accompanied by certain persons of that town, who begged to be permitted to partake of the honours of the sitting, and one of whom, it would seem, gave, as a toast, “the immortal memory of the Rt. Hon. WILLIAM PITT;” whereupon, it is reported, Mr. Canning rose and said, “That it was expected of them who were present that they should return thanks for any honour conferred on their absent friends. It might be pardonable in him if he expressed his acknowledgment for the honour they had done to the memory of Mr. Pitt, and in doing which they had not the sense of Liverpool only, but of England; not of England only, but of Europe, of posterity, and of the world. He said, he had *always been true to his principles*. But there had been instances where his principles had been misunderstood, but he knew that in this place they had always found able advocates.—There was one point on which, in the course of the recent contest, his memory had been called in question, and his principles misrepresented—that he was the advocate and author of war. If there lived a statesman in the world whose interests, individually, were founded in peace,—if there was ever a statesman of whom it might be presumed, that in conducting his country into war he was led by a sense of irresistible necessity, it must have

“been in the foundation of his firm judgment, and laid on the same basis with that of the *prosperity of his country*. When posterity should look back upon the memory of that great man, they would discriminate two different eras in his life. The one on his succession to the government of the country, he found the state dilapidated, and its resources enervated by an ill-conducted war. He laid the foundation of that **SOLID SYSTEM** of which it was enough to say that it lived in our *breasts unimpaired*, and had endured amid the storms which had assailed it since that time. Whether it were the fault of Mr. Pitt or not the fault (he meant of his judgment, and which would afford a fair test of historical controversy,) whether he began the war which has continued with little intermission to the present time—whether that were his fault or not, it had been by his plans that the country had been enabled to continue it. But he did not think even without his councils war could have been deferred. A second era of his political life began at the period, when from the centre of Europe burst forth that volcanic eruption of *desolating principles*, which threatened to overwhelm the civilized world: these principles, he observed, he had successfully resisted. After some further remarks he observed, that he trusted that into whatever hands the Government of this great country should be committed, they would ever keep *his example* before their eyes; and that they would learn from his example, *exertion* abroad.”

—Any thing more empty, more completely devoid of sense than this latterbirth harangue, I do not remember to have met with even in the reports of the debates in the Honourable House.—The reader will perceive, that, even in the face of this crew of war-mongers, Mr. Canning did not think it proper to attempt a justification of the beginning of the late war against France. Yet, that must be justified, or the memory of Pitt must stand blasted in the sight of posterity.—But, he was, it seems, the author of “a **SOLID SYSTEM**, of which it was **ENOUGH** to say, that it lived in our **BREASTS** unimpaired, and had endured amidst the storms that had assailed it since that time.”—What did he mean? What *system*? I suppose, that the system he alludes to must be the *funding system*; and, if so, Mr. Canning,

it is not quite enough to say, that “it still lives in our *breasts* unimpaired.” It is in our *purses*; in our purses, good Clerk of the Hanaper; it is there that a system of finance ought to be unimpaired; but, you deal so much in rhetorical figures, that, perhaps, by *breasts* you may mean purses, as the things nearest to the hearts of your hearers. If so, your assertion was merely false, it being perfectly notorious, that the system, so far from being *solid*, was the most hollow and deceitful that ever was invented by man, and that it has produced and is producing all the ruinous effects that were anticipated from its adoption.—Indeed, a man must be possessed of a surprising stock of impudence to be able to stand up in the midst of some hundreds of persons, and applaud the system of Pitt for its *solidity*, at a time when the paper-money, created by that system, is so depreciated as to require acts of parliament and severe penalties to prevent it from being openly exchanged at a great discount against the legal coin of the kingdom. The late parliament did, indeed, declare by solemn *resolution*, that the Bank paper was equal in value to gold and silver coin in the estimation of the people, and they, in a few weeks afterwards, passed an *act*, making it a misdemeanor in any one to exchange the paper against coin at a discount! These two proceedings will immortalize that parliament; but, for an individual, outside of the walls of St. Stephen, to have the impudence to assert, that the paper system is unimpaired, when the regular Price Currents tell us, that Guinea Gold will sell for *Five pounds eight shillings an ounce*, in paper, while it is well known, that it will sell for no more than *Three pounds seventeen shillings and ten pence halfpenny*, in the legal coin of the kingdom; for a man, unprotected by privilege, to insult, in this outrageous manner, the understanding of his hearers would surpass belief, if we did not know, that those hearers were amongst the most stupid as well as the most servile and base of mankind.—Pitt’s plans, we are here told, have *enabled us to continue the contest*. That is to say, they have enabled our government to carry on the war by the means of loans, taxation, and bank notes. Really, to hear this man of froth, one would imagine, that it was good for a nation to be *exhausted*; for its paper to become *depreciated*; for its gold and silver to *quit the land*. *Continue* the contest! So much the worse. It would have been good if

the government had been reduced to the necessity of discontinuing the contest many years ago. But, the question is, will Pitt's plans enable us to *get safe out of this contest*? And this question every man is ready to answer in the negative.—Mr. Canning concludes with the old cheat, which, though threadbare long ago, has, it seems, still its uses. He told the crew, that Pitt had "*successfully resisted that volcanic eruption of desolating principles which, at one time, threatened to overwhelm the civilized world.*"—He alludes here to the principles of the French revolution; and, if they did actually threaten to overwhelm the civilized world, is it true, reader, that Pitt *successfully resisted them*? How were they expected to operate in the work of *overwhelming*? This flashy orator delights in figures; but, at last, we must, if we can, reduce his words to some plain meaning. What, then, does he mean by the *overwhelming of the civilized world* by principles? Why he must mean, that those principles tended, not to the producing of a real deluge, or flood, in the civilized world, but that they clearly tended to the subversion of the settled order of things in the civilized world; that they tended to the oversetting of establishments in religion, in law, in ranks and degrees, and, especially to the pulling down of sovereigns and of thrones. That this is the only rational sense in which the words can be taken is, I think, evident; and, that being the case, what impudence, what brass, how hardened the front or how empty the skull, of the man who could stand up and assert, that Pitt had *successfully resisted those principles*, when, at the same moment, it was a notorious fact, that scarcely a throne remained unoverset in the civilized world, and that all the establishments, connected with regal or aristocratical sway, had shared the same fate? Perhaps Mr. Canning meant to say, that Pitt had successfully resisted the principles of the *first French revolutionists*; that is to say, the *principles of freedom*; and, if that were his meaning, it must be confessed that his patron and the object of his praise was but too successful. Nevertheless, there is much which he left undone. He was unable, and so have been and will be, his followers, to restore the ecclesiastical and feudal and aristocratical tyranny in France and Italy, in Switzerland and in Germany. To give a pithy instance or two: Pitt was unable to re-establish *Lettres-de-cachet*, the *Gabelle*,

the *Corvée*, and the *Tithes*, in France. He was able by the aid of that system which has made the English guinea worth 29 shillings in Bank Paper; by such means he was able to plunge France into a state that called for the government of a single man; but, he was, with all the hundreds of millions of our money that he squandered, unable to re-establish any one of those oppressions by which the people of France were induced to revolt against their old government.—Through the war of Pitt and millions of our money the people of France were deprived of the sort of government that they at first contemplated; but, they were not deprived of a very large part of the advantages which they expected from such a government. They revolted to get rid of *Lettres-de-cachet*, the *Gabelle*, the *Corvée*, the *Tithes*, and numerous degrading and cruel feudal rights; they revolted to get rid of a corrupt and partial administration of justice; they revolted to get rid of a clergy and nobility who insulted and oppressed them without mercy. This was the grand principle of their revolution, and this principle has not been resisted. However, if the merchants and traders of Liverpool and of the rest of the kingdom are satisfied with what has been done in the way of resistance to French principles, I congratulate them thereon with all my heart, and leave them and Mr. Canning to the enjoyment of all the tranquillity and security which that resistance is, of course, calculated to afford them.

WM. COBBETT.

London, 5th Nov. 1812.

P. S. Since writing the above I have seen a Speech of Mr. Canning, made at *Manchester*. This speech I shall notice in my next.

WESTMINSTER ELECTION.

Letters of Sir Francis Burdett and Lord Cochrane, upon their being returned for the City of Westminster, in 1812.

The following Letters have passed between the Committee appointed to conduct the Election for this City and their Representatives. The Resolutions of the General Meeting on the 5th inst. at the Crown and Anchor, had been previously transmitted to Sir Francis Burdett and Lord Cochrane.

To Sir Francis Burdett, Bart.

Sir,—In announcing to you that you have been again returned to Parliament for the City of Westminster, we cannot suppress the satisfaction we feel in observing the steady, though slow advance of public opinion, manifested in the disposition of the Electors of Westminster to do their duty to themselves and to their country—to the utter dismay of all Parties, and the destruction of the formerly overwhelming influence of base, corrupt, and infamous Administrations, who have merely regarded the *ruling*, not the *benefiting* the nation:—who have considered *power as every thing, the peace, prosperity, and happiness* of the people as nothing.—We would willingly “spare you the mortification of “passing a painful life in undignified efforts to stem the torrent of corruption.” But when we contemplate the effects produced in this great City, exemplified as they now are, in the return of yourself and your late worthy colleague, *without expense or personal trouble*; without communication with either, and without a struggle—when we hear from various places, that the People, rousing from their apathy, are endeavouring to imitate the example of Westminster, we cannot but indulge the hope, that at the next Election, better informed by precept, by example, and by experience, they will so exert themselves, that the “torrent of corruption” may no longer be irresistible, nor your honourable and manly efforts be “unavailing” in promoting the happiness of your country.

By Order of the Committee for conducting the Election for the City and Liberty of Westminster, appointed at a Public Meeting of Electors, Friends to Purity of Election, on Monday, the 6th October, 1812.

SAMUEL BROOKS, Chairman.

Committee Room, 38, King-street,
Covent Garden, 9th Oct. 1812.

(A Letter to the same effect was written to Lord Cochrane.)

ANSWERS.

Oxford, Oct. 16, 1812.

DEAR SIR,—I found your very flattering Letter on my return here from Tiverton. The noble behaviour of the Electors of Westminster towards me, makes it impossible for me to refuse any exertion in my

power which they may think advantageous. The enclosed Answer you will have the goodness to communicate.—Your's, very sincerely,

F. BURDETT.

To the Electors of Westminster.

GENTLEMEN,—It is impossible for me to be insensible to the extraordinary mark of confidence with which you have recently honoured me. And although I am thereby again placed in an arduous and difficult situation, from which I should gladly have withdrawn, I cannot, under such auspices, refuse to undertake the forlorn hope of combating that wide-spreading corruption, which seems almost to convert the severity of satire, “that not to be corrupted is the “shame,” into mere matter of fact; or, at least, to give room to suppose such to be the prevailing opinion. Nothing, therefore, remains for the friends of their country, but to stand it out as long as they can, prepared, at all times, to make as decent an *exit* as their enemies will permit.—Gentlemen, the small portion which remains of the real Representation of the People (the sole Constitutional Guardian of our Liberty and Property) is now confined to the Counties and great Towns; and even in them, for the most part, Government patronage, places, pensions, promises, threats, and the various methods practised at Elections, render an uncorrupt body of Electors no more to be expected than an uncorrupt Parliament.—I may, however, Gentlemen, be allowed to say, without incurring the suspicion of flattery, that your conduct forms a shining exception. A conduct unparalleled in the annals of this, or, perhaps, of any other country; proving to demonstration the falsehood of those malignant assertions of unprincipled men for traitorous ends, that the great mass of the nation is corrupt, and that Reform is, therefore, neither desirable nor attainable. This outrageous doctrine, invented by knavery to palliate plunder, you have nobly confuted, and furnished a practical and unanswerable argument in favour of freedom of Election.—Gentlemen, at the Revolution one honest line, securing to the People freedom of Election, would have been worth more than all that tedious and ostentatious display of principles and objects set forth, but never really provided for, by the Bill of Rights. I would fain hope, that the example given by the Electors of Westminster, might encourage other places still to contend for that small portion of Independ-

ence which yet remains in the country; and thereby keep alive, at least in the remembrance of their countrymen, their ancient constitutional right to a *full, fair, and free Representation of the People in Parliament*, their only quiet and peaceable security at all times for their rights and property, against the despotism and plunder of the few.—For these purposes you shall always find me, either in or out of Parliament, **READY TO LAY DOWN MY LIFE.**—Gentlemen, I have received the highest honour I can receive, and the best reward—the approbation of those who trusted me, on the expiration of the trust.—That I should have, and that the Electors of Westminster should think, that I have conducted myself in it with honour and integrity, will be a never-failing source of satisfaction to me, as long as the powers of recollection shall remain to,—Gentlemen, your most affectionate and devoted Servant,

FRANCIS BURDETT.

Oxford, Oct. 16, 1812.

12, *Portman-square, Oct. 14, 1812.*

DEAR SIR,—You will oblige me by handing the enclosed to the Committee for conducting the Election for Westminster.—Believe me sincerely yours,

COCHRANE.

To Mr. Saml. Brooks.

To the Electors of Westminster.

GENTLEMEN,—Being unable to convey in words the sensations I experience in reflecting on the manner in which you have returned me to Parliament, I shall leave it to you, who are capable of such acts, to estimate my feelings.—Permit me, however, in acknowledging the receipt of your Letter of the 10th inst., and transmitted to me through your Committee, to trespass a little on your attention, to offer my congratulations on the effect which has already been produced by the example set by you, on a former occasion, to the Electors of the United Kingdom, and to anticipate, that on every future recurrence to the elective franchise, the noble principle for which you are contending will be felt more strongly, and that “the People, rousing from their apathy,” will imitate the City of Westminster in the purity of their Elections.—In this view of the subject, Gentlemen, I cannot but congratulate you on the recent exercise of the Royal prerogative by

the PRINCE REGENT: and being fully convinced that dissolutions of Parliament contribute to the emancipation of the Crown, even more (in the present state of the Representation) than to the Liberty of the Subject, I confess that I am not one of those who anticipate that the late constitutional measure will be followed by a breach of the law.—Gentlemen, no part of the cant of the times seems to me more absurd and hypocritical, than the declamation by party men against what they term the “overwhelming influence of the Crown,” when the fact is notorious to us all, that the ruling Faction in Parliament seize the offices of State, and share them amongst themselves. If a doubt as to this truth is entertained by any one, let him reflect on the language of the Parties themselves, “Such an Administration cannot stand.” And why, Gentlemen? not because the Royal protection has been withdrawn, but because a sufficient number do not agree as to the division of the spoil. What motive has the Crown for supporting scandalous abuses that are hostile to the interests of the public? As far as the question regards those who fatten on the plunder of their Country, it is needless for me to put it. Our liberties in these days are not in danger from violent and open exercise of Regal Authority; such acts being free from the deception practised by the mock Representatives of the People, would not be tolerated for an instant. No, Gentlemen, it is by the House of Commons alone that the Constitution is subverted, the prerogatives of the Crown usurped, the Rights of the People trampled upon.—Gentlemen, I shall not attempt to enumerate the decisions of the late House of Commons, that will stamp indelible disgrace on the memory of the principal actors, who cannot escape from the contempt and execration of posterity, like the nameless individuals who composed their corrupt majorities. The *effects*, however, of the system of corruption can be more briefly stated—the prolongation of war—the increase of the National Debt—the depreciation of our currency—the disappearance of our coin—the stagnation of our commerce, and the consequent unexampled embarrassment of our manufacturers.—These are the result—for all which evils, Gentlemen, there is no remedy but in the control that would be exercised over the public expenditure, by an honest House of Commons, and in the attention that such a House would pay to the interest of the State. Without a change in the principle

on which Members are returned to Parliament, these objects cannot be attained; nor would a Peace, in the present state of things, produce the benefits anticipated by those who are not aware that the manufacturers of France undersell those of England wherever they come in competition. Even at Malta, our commercial depot, for which we commenced a war that has cost us *Five Hundred Millions sterling* (a sum that would have annihilated the National Debt), when I was there about two years ago, French goods, imported under licenses, were thence distributed, not only to the neighbouring States of Barbary, but to Spain, and even to Gibraltar! Glass, for the use of the British fleet in the Mediterranean, was brought from the dominions of Buonaparté, because it was cheaper! I am in possession of official documents to prove these facts. The stores were full of English goods, which afforded profit to the merchant, not by the course of trade that is beneficial to a country, but by taking the dollars collected to the Commissary General, who furnished them with bills at 30 per cent. premium, paid out of your pockets.—Such was the course of exchange caused by the demand for specie for the Sicilian subsidy, and for the pay and maintenance of an army of 16,000 men, to prolong the oppressions of a people, who were able and willing to defend themselves, but not to uphold the tyranny of a wicked Government, whose abominable despotism had made a desert of the most fertile soil in the world. A spot which was once the granary of Rome.—To return, however, to our own folly, and to the cause of the ruin of our trade, which the abolition of the Orders in Council cannot restore, although their promulgation contributed to destroy it—let me call your attention to the total neglect of Ministers to the principle of the navigation laws, which were the foundation of the commercial greatness of this country, and of its naval superiority; and in doing so now, you will remember that I have more than once noticed the subject, and that I stated to you, three years ago, from documents presented to the House of Commons, that there were then actually 27,000 foreign seamen (the greatest part of whom belonged to countries subject to France) employed in the trade of the Thames.—Yes, Gentlemen, of the River Thames!—Whilst in the same year there were only 16,000 British sailors occupied in its commerce to and from all parts of the Continent! although the market of Spain had

been opened. This was one of the effects of the virtual abandonment of the Orders in Council, whilst they were nominally upheld as of vital importance. Perhaps, as it is the nature of corruption to spread, in order to increase the patronage of Ministers, by *the profits arising to individuals* from a monopoly of trade, and the sale of licenses—a disgraceful traffic—derogatory to the character of the nation—thus are we involved in war with America.—Hurtful, however, as the measures we have pursued have been, our total neglect of others has proved still more prejudicial: for whilst France has inflicted the evils of war, or intimidated surrounding States into compliance with her views, we, who have possessed the facilities to direct every portion of our force to unknown points within the extensive range of two thousand miles of unprotected shore, have never even made a demonstration with intention to disturb the enemy's projects, and force him to keep his legions at home, where they must be paid and maintained by the Treasury of France; but have left him at full liberty to prosecute his plans at the expense of our Allies, or in the way most conducive to his interests: and, surely, none could suit him better than to fix the little army of England in the centre of the Peninsula, where its movements are not of a desultory nature, and where, admitting the great ability of its Commander, a comparatively small portion of the enemy's force is fully adequate to counteract its *known movements*! “Just as barbarians engage at boxing, so you make war with Philip; for when one of these receives a blow, that blow engages him: if struck in another part, to that part his hands are shifted; but to ward off the blow, or to watch his antagonist, for this he hath neither skill nor spirit. Even so, if you hear that Philip is in the Chersonesus, you send forces thither; if in Thermopylae, thither; if in any other place, you hurry up and down, you follow his standard.—But no useful scheme for carrying on the war—no wise provisions are ever thought of, until you hear of some enterprise in execution, or already crowned with success. They who conduct a war with prudence, are not to follow, but to direct events. But you, Athenians! though possessed of the greatest power of all kinds, Ships, Infantry, Cavalry, Treasure; yet to this day, have never employed any of them seasonably.”—“It is not in our power to provide a force able to meet him in the open

field, but we must harass him by depredations: thus the war must be carried on."

—Gentlemen, as the duration of war, by increasing the taxes, will occasion the permanent decay of our commerce, you will forgive my transcribing these observations, delivered by one of the ablest men of former times, as they are very applicable to our situation. What part of those kingdoms would be secure from attacks if the French possessed a naval superiority, with only 20,000 troops at their disposal—it is obvious that there must be in every district a force equal to that which the enemy could bring against it? I shall abstain from directing your attention to particular objects in illustration of the fact, for the reasons given in my first Letter which I had the honour to address to your Committee. —Gentlemen, I cannot avoid stating a fact to you which I have often offered to prove at the Bar of the late corrupt House of Commons; namely, that whilst our commerce has decreased, that kind of trade which is most beneficial to a State, has augmented on the shores of the enemy, in a prodigious ratio, and the produce of the Northern and Southern Provinces is freely interchanged under the protection of the abuses in our Admiralty Courts; which afforded it better security than all the batteries of France; the plain reason for which is, that each of the numerous coasting vessels must, for the benefit of the Court, be separately condemned, at an expense greater than was formerly demanded for the adjudication of an Indiaman! Gentlemen, the rapacity of the Courts is frequently not satisfied by appropriating the whole proceeds to themselves, but the captors are compelled to pay an additional sum for thus performing a service to their country. Gentlemen, that you may have a correct notion of a Proctor's bill, I take the liberty of enclosing one for your inspection, which I assure you, may be considered very moderate, being only 6 fathoms and a quarter long, or 37 feet 6—whereas I now possess others, that extend to 50 feet; but I prefer sending this to your Committee, as it is the one produced by myself in the House of Commons, and by the venerable Earl of Suffolk in the House of Lords—the exhibition of which was pronounced, by the present Lord Chancellor (the brother of the Judge of the Admiralty Court) to be "a species of *mummary* never before witnessed within those walls, and altogether unbecoming the gravity of that branch of

the Legislature."—Whether the attempt to expose abuses, which paralyse the efforts of the British navy, deserve the stigma thus cast upon it, by so grave a character, I leave you, Gentlemen, to determine.—

I beg that the items may not pass unobserved, where the Proctor notes his pecuniary reward for attending, seeing, consulting, and admonishing himself, in his other capacity as Marshal, of all which he makes an affidavit, for which also he charges a fee!—I am aware that I have trespassed longer already on your attention than I ought to have done, had the pure principles on which you conducted the election allowed me to address you personally; however, as this opportunity did not occur, you will, I trust, forgive my adding an extract from a statement which I made two years ago in the House of Commons, on the subject of the Navy Estimate, with a view to contrast the rewards granted for different kinds of services.—Gentlemen, it appears on the Pension List of the Navy, for the year 1810, that "thirty-one Commissioners, Commissioners' wives and Clerks, have £3,899 more amongst them than is paid to all the wounded Officers of the Navy of England!—Thirteen daughters of Admirals and Captains, some of whom fell in the service of the country, have amongst them all, from the gratitude of the nation, a sum less than a Commissioner's widow!—viz.

4 Daughters of the gallant Capt. Courtney, £10 10s. each per ann.

1	ditto	of Adm. Sir A. Mitchell,	} £25 each.
2	ditto	of Admiral Epworth,	
1	ditto	of Admiral Kepple,	
1	ditto	of Captain Mann,	
4	ditto	of Admiral Moriarte,	

Captain Johnson receives £45 a year for the loss of an arm: and poor Lieutenant Chambers, who lost both his legs, gets £80, whilst the Clerk of the Ticket Office retires on £700.—To speak less in detail, 32 Flag Officers, 22 Captains, 50 Lieutenants, 180 Masters, 36 Surgeons, 23 Pursers, 91 Boatswains, 97 Gunners, 202 Carpenters, 41 Cooks, cost the country £4,028 less than the *net proceeds* of the sinecures of Lords Arden, Camden, and Buckingham!—All the superannuated Admirals, Captains, and Lieutenants, have but £1,012 more amongst them than Earl Camden's sinecure alone!—All that is paid to the wounded Officers of the British Navy, and to the wives and children of those dead or killed in action, does not

amount, by £214, to as much as Lord Arden's sinecure!—The Marquis of Buckingham's sinecure will maintain the whole victualling departments at Chatham, Dover, Gibraltar, the Downs, Heligoland, Malta, Cape of Good Hope, and Rio Janeiro, and leave £5,466 in the Treasury. Three of these comfortable sinecures would maintain the Dockyard Establishments at Portsmouth and Plymouth; and the sinecures and offices executed wholly by deputy, would more than maintain the ordinary establishment of all the Royal Dock-yards in the Kingdom. Calculating at the rate of allowance made for Captain Johnson's arm, Lord Arden's sinecures are equal to the value of 1,022 Captain's arms; or, by poor Lieutenant Chambers' pension, to 488 pair of Lieutenants' legs!!!—Comment is unnecessary: such, Gentlemen, is the reward for long and faithful services; that, for exertion, I have already shewn you.—Thus the war lingers on, the supplies for which are voted by those who are interested in its continuance: nor will it ever be terminated successfully in pitched battles by the military force of England against the resources of France. Even on the supposition of perfect equality, more men would perish before the contest could be decided, than England now maintains on the Continent—could we supply the deficiency?—Gentlemen, to shew you that there is no hope from a change of Party, unless a Reform in the Commons House of Parliament shall previously take place, “the pensions given by the late Whig Administrations to Commissioners, Clerks, and others, whom they forced out of office to make room for their friends, amounted in 13 months to £1,508 more than the present Administration have given away in the three years that have elapsed since,”—*i. e.* up to the year 1810.—The example of the industrious bee demonstrates, by the laws of Nature, that the drone is not to live at the expense of the community—notwithstanding what the Whigs have said of sinecures being held by tenure, equal to that of freehold property. I have the honour to be, Gentlemen, respectfully, your obedient humble servant,

COCHRANE.

12, Portman-square, Oct. 14.

MR. COBBETT,

Sir,

I am the father of a family, and much interested that my children should be taught truth at a very early period of life. In consequence of this desire it has been my custom never to prevent them from reading controversial writings upon any subject. I lay it down as an axiom, that the mind, if it be not restrained by an improper bias, will rest, at last, upon Truth. I am led to address you now from having waited a long time for the promised refutation of Paine's Third Part of the Age of Reason, by your good Rector of Botley. By some means Paine's work has got into my family, and as that Gentleman says that it ought to have an antidote, and that he can furnish that antidote, I am very anxious to have it for my children and for myself, as I would not willingly continue in error.

I should state to you, that when this subject was agitated before, in order that it might be of benefit to the bodies of some persons as well as to their souls, a few lovers of Truth entered into a subscription to purchase a young pig, which we have endeavoured so to feed, as to make it worthy of the occasion, and which we mean to offer to the Worthy Rector, upon the publication of his book, to be conferred by him upon the most deserving church-going poor man in the parish. When we undertook this charge, we had no idea but that the work would be out long before we could fatten our Pig; but, Sir, the animal is now so large and so unwieldy, that he is no unapt emblem of a dignitary of the Church, and really the expense of keeping up his fat is so enormous, that to us, who are not in affluent circumstances, it is a matter of very serious import. I hope, therefore, Sir, that you will beg of your Parson to hasten a little with the work, that the poor man may have his gift, and my friends and myself be eased of the burden of the pig.

I am, Sir, truly yours,

VERAX.

Oct. 29, 1812.

ENGLISH LIBERTY OF THE PRESS,

As illustrated in the Prosecution and Punishment of

WILLIAM COBBETT.

[607]

IN order that my countrymen and that the world may not be deceived, duped, and cheated upon this subject, I, WILLIAM COBBETT, of Botley, in Hampshire, put upon record the following facts; to wit: That, on the 24th June, 1809, the following article was published in a London news-paper, called the *COURIER*:—"The Mutiny amongst the *LOCAL MILITIA*, which broke out at Ely, was *fortunately* suppressed on Wednesday by the *arrival* of four squadrons of the *GERMAN LEGION CAVALRY* from Bury, under the *command* of General Auckland. Five of the *ringleaders* were tried by a Court-Martial, and *sentenced to receive 500 lashes each*, part of which *punishment* they received on Wednesday, and *a part* was remitted. *A stoppage for their knapsacks* was the ground of the complaint that *excited* this mutinous spirit, which occasioned *the men* to surround their officers, and demand *what* they deemed their arrears. The first *division* of the German Legion halted yesterday *at Newmarket* on their return to Bury."—That, on the 1st July, 1809, I published, in the *Political Register*, an article censuring, in the strongest terms, these proceedings; that, for so doing, the Attorney General prosecuted, as seditious libellers, and by Ex-Officio Information, me, and also my printer, my publisher, and one of the principal retailers of the *Political Register*; that I was brought to trial on the 15th June, 1810, and was, by a Special Jury, that is to say, by 12 men out of 48 appointed by the Master of the Crown Office, found guilty; that, on the 20th of the same month, I was compelled to give bail for my appearance to receive judgment; and that, as I came up from Botley (to which place I had returned to my family and my farm on the evening of the 15th), a Tipstaff went down from London in order to seize me, personally; that, on the 9th of July, 1810, I, together with my printer, publisher, and the news-man, were brought into the Court of King's Bench to receive judgment; that the three former were sentenced to be imprisoned for some months in the King's Bench prison; that I was sentenced to be imprisoned for two years in Newgate, the great receptacle for malefactors, and the front of which is the scene of numerous hangings in the course of every year; that the part of the prison in which I was sentenced to be confined is sometimes inhabited by felons, that felons were actually in it at the time I entered it; that one man was taken out of it to be transported in about 48 hours after I was put into the same yard with him; and that it is the place of confinement for men guilty of unnatural crimes, of whom there are four in it at this time; that, besides this imprisonment, I was sentenced to pay a thousand pounds *TO THE KING*, and to give security for my good behaviour for seven years, myself in the sum of 3,000 pounds, and

[608]

two sureties in the sum of 1,000 pounds each; that the whole of this sentence has been executed upon me, that I have been imprisoned the two years, have paid the thousand pounds *TO THE KING*, and have given the bail, Timothy Brown and Peter Walker, Esqrs. being my sureties; that the Attorney General was Sir Vicary Gibbs, the Judge who sat at the trial Lord Ellenborough, the four Judges who sat at passing sentence Ellenborough, Grose, Le Blanc, and Bailey; and that the jurors were, Thomas Rhodes of Hampstead Road, John Davis of Southampton Place, James Ellis of Tottenham Court Road, John Richards of Bayswater, Thomas Marsham of Baker Street, Robert Heathcote of High Street Marylebone, John Maud of York Place Marylebone, George Bagster of Church Terrace Pancras, Thomas Taylor of Red Lion Square, David Deane of St. John Street, William Palmer of Upper Street Islington, Henry Favre of Pall Mall; that the Prime Ministers during the time were Spencer Perceval, until he was shot by John Bellingham, and after that Robert B. Jenkinson, Earl of Liverpool; that the prosecution and sentence took place in the reign of King George the Third, and that, he having become insane during my imprisonment, the 1,000 pounds was paid to his son, the Prince Regent, in his behalf; that, during my imprisonment, I wrote and published 364 Essays and Letters upon political subjects; that, during the same time, I was visited by persons from 197 cities and towns, many of them as a sort of deputies from Societies or Clubs; that, at the expiration of my imprisonment, on the 9th of July, 1812, a great dinner was given in London for the purpose of receiving me, at which dinner upwards of 600 persons were present, and at which Sir Francis Burdett presided; that dinners and other parties were held on the same occasion in many other places in England; that, on my way home, I was received at Alton, the first town in Hampshire, with the ringing of the Church bells; that a respectable company met me and gave me a dinner at Winchester; that I was drawn from more than the distance of a mile into Botley by the people; that, upon my arrival in the village, I found all the people assembled to receive me; that I concluded the day by explaining to them the cause of my imprisonment, and by giving them clear notions respecting the flogging of the Local Militia-men at Ely, and respecting the employment of German Troops; and, finally, which is more than a compensation for my losses and all my sufferings, I am in perfect health and strength, and, though I must, for the sake of six children, feel the diminution that has been made in my property (thinking it right in me to decline the offer of a subscription), I have the consolation to see growing up three sons, upon whose hearts, I trust, all these facts will be engraven.

WM. COBBETT.

Botley, July 23, 1812.

Published by R. BAGSHAW, Brydges-Street, Covent-Garden.

LONDON: Printed by J. M'Creery, Black Horse-Court, Fleet-street.